

RS-002, “PROCESSING APPLICATIONS FOR EARLY SITE PERMITS”

ATTACHMENT 2

2.4.1. HYDROLOGIC DESCRIPTION

REVIEW RESPONSIBILITIES

Primary - Mechanical and Civil Engineering Branch (EMEB)

Secondary - None

I. AREAS OF REVIEW

The areas of review under this section of this review standard for the site safety assessment that supports an early site permit (ESP) application are:

1. Identification of the interface of a nuclear power plant or plants of specified type (or falling within a plant parameter envelope [PPE]) that might be constructed on the proposed site with the hydrosphere.
2. Identification of hydrologic causal mechanisms that may necessitate special plant design bases or operating limitations with regard to floods and water supply needs.
3. Identification of surface and ground water uses that may be affected by operation of a nuclear power plant or plants of specified type (or falling within a PPE) that might be constructed on the proposed site.

The review of Section 2.4.1 calls for identification of the hydrologic characteristics of streams, lakes (e.g., location, size, shape, drainage area), shore regions, the regional and local groundwater environments, and existing or proposed water control structures (upstream and downstream) influencing the type of flooding mechanisms that may adversely effect safety aspects of plant siting and operation.

II. ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA

Acceptance criteria for this section of this review standard address 10 CFR Parts 52 and 100 (Refs. 1 and 2) as they relate to identifying and evaluating hydrologic features of the site. The regulations at 10 CFR 52.17(a) and 10 CFR 100.20(c) require that physical characteristics of a site (including seismology, meteorology, geology, and hydrology) be taken into account to determine its acceptability for a nuclear power reactor. In addition, 10 CFR 100.20(c) addresses the hydrologic characteristics of a proposed site that may affect the consequences of an escape of radioactive material from the facility. Factors important to hydrologic radionuclide transport, described in 10 CFR 100.20(c)(3), should be obtained from on-site measurements.

To satisfy the hydrologic requirements of 10 CFR Parts 52 and 100, the applicant's safety assessment should contain a description of the surface and subsurface hydrologic characteristics of the site and region. This description should be sufficient to assess the

acceptability of the site and the potential for those characteristics to influence the design of structures, systems, or components of a nuclear power plant or plants (or falling within a PPE) that might be constructed on the proposed site.

Meeting this requirement provides reasonable assurance that the hydrologic characteristics of the site and potential hydrologic phenomena would pose no undue risk to the type of facility (or facility falling within a PPE) proposed for the site. Further, it provides reasonable assurance that such a facility would pose no undue risk of radioactive contamination to surface or subsurface water from either normal operations or as the result of a reactor accident.

Note: Though not required at the ESP stage, the applicant for a combined license (COL) will need to demonstrate compliance with General Design Criterion 2 (Ref. 3) as it relates to structures, systems, and components important to safety being designed to withstand the effects of hurricanes, floods, tsunamis, and seiches.

To meet the requirements of the hydrologic aspects of 10 CFR Parts 52 and 100, the following specific criteria are used:

1. The information presented in safety assessment Section 2.4.1 forms the basis for subsequent hydrologic engineering analysis with respect to the application for an ESP. Therefore, completeness and clarity are of paramount importance. Maps should be legible and adequate in coverage to substantiate applicable data. Site topographic maps should be of good quality and of sufficient scale to allow independent analysis of pre-construction drainage patterns. Data on surface water users, location with respect to the site, type of use, and quantity of surface water used are necessary. Inventories of surface water users should be consistent with regional hydrologic inventories reported by applicable state and federal agencies. The description of the hydrologic characteristics of streams, lakes, and shore regions should correspond to those of the United States Geological Survey (USGS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Soil Conservation Service (SCS), Corps of Engineers, or appropriate state and river basin agencies. Descriptions of all existing or proposed reservoirs and dams (both upstream and downstream) that could influence conditions at the site should be provided. Descriptions may be obtained from reports of the USGS, United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR), Corps of Engineers, and others. Generally, reservoir descriptions of a quality similar to those contained in pertinent data sheets of a standard Corps of Engineers Hydrology Design Memorandum are adequate. Tabulations of drainage areas, types of structures, appurtenances, ownership, seismic and spillway design criteria, elevation-storage relationships, and short- and long-term storage allocations should be provided.
2. Appendix A, "Hydrologic Engineering Site Visits," to this section of the review standard (Ref. 4) details the purposes and procedures of the site visit. The site visit serves to acquaint the reviewer with the site and to provide an independent confirmation of the hydrologic characteristics of the site and adjacent environs.

III. REVIEW PROCEDURES

The information presented in safety assessment Section 2.4.1 is generally amenable to independent verification through cross-checks with other safety assessment sections and chapters, available publications relating to hydrologic characteristics of the site region, and by site visits. The review procedure consists of evaluating the completeness of the information

and data (Ref. 5) by sequential comparison with information available from references. Based on the description of the hydrosphere (e.g., geographic location and regional hydrologic features) potential site flood mechanisms are identified. Subsequent safety assessment sections addressing the mechanisms are cross-checked to ensure that data and information needed therein for review and substantiation are available.

An important facet of the review procedure for this and other sections of this review standard in hydrologic areas is the site visit. The site visit provides the principal technical reviewer with independent confirmation of hydrologic characteristics of the site and adjacent environs. The site visit is discussed in Appendix A to this section of the review standard.

IV. EVALUATION FINDINGS

For ESP reviews, findings will consist of a brief general description of the site with respect to the general hydrosphere as required by 10 CFR Parts 52 and 100, and of the offsite uses of surface water. The hydrologic description for each plant site is unique. The review verifies that sufficient information has been provided and will support conclusions of the following type, to be included in the staff's safety evaluation report:

The proposed site is located about 42 kilometers (26 miles) SSE of XYZ City on the southwest bank of the DEF River at about river kilometer 245 (mile 152). Plant grade will be at about elevation 67 m (220 feet) above mean sea level (MSL).

As set forth above, the applicant has provided sufficient information pertaining to the general hydrologic characteristics of the site including descriptions of water bodies, water control structures, and water users. Therefore, the staff concludes that the requirements of 10 CFR Parts 52 and 100, with respect to general hydrologic descriptions, have been met.

V. IMPLEMENTATION

The following is intended to provide guidance to applicants and licensees regarding the NRC staff's plans for using this section of this review standard.

This section will be used by the staff when performing safety evaluations of ESP applications submitted by applicants pursuant to 10 CFR Part 52. Except in those cases in which the applicant proposes an acceptable alternative method for complying with specified portions of the Commission's regulations, the method described herein will be used by the staff in its evaluation of conformance with Commission regulations.

Implementation schedules for conformance to parts of the method discussed herein are contained in the referenced regulatory guides and NUREGs.

VI. REFERENCES

Because of the geographic diversity of plant sites and the large number of hydrologic references, no specific tabulation is given here. In general, maps and charts by the USGS, NOAA, Army Map Service (AMS), and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA); water-supply papers of the USGS; River Basin Reports of the Corps of Engineers; and other publications of

state, federal, and other regulatory bodies, describing hydrologic characteristics and water utilization in the site vicinity and region, are referred to on an "as-available" basis.

1. 10 CFR Part 52, "Early Site Permits; Standard Design Certifications; and Combined Licenses for Nuclear Power Plants."
2. 10 CFR Part 100, "Reactor Site Criteria."
3. 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix A, General Design Criterion 2, "Design Bases for Protection Against Natural Phenomena."
4. Appendix A, RS-002 Section 2.4.1, "Hydrologic Engineering Site Visits," attached.
5. Regulatory Guide 1.70, "Standard Format and Content of Safety Analysis Reports for Nuclear Power Plants."

APPENDIX A
RS-002 SECTION 2.4.1
HYDROLOGIC ENGINEERING SITE VISITS

I. PURPOSES

The purposes of hydrologic engineering site visits are as follows:

1. Acquaint the reviewer with general site and regional hydrologic characteristics and topography.
2. Confirm the applicant's general appraisal of the hydrologic interfaces between the site and a nuclear power plant or plants of specified type (or falling within a PPE) that might be constructed on the site.
3. Review specific hydrologic engineering problem areas with the applicant, its engineers, and its consultants.

The site visit objectives will have been achieved if, in addition to viewing pertinent hydrologic features, the reviewer has had the opportunity to discuss specific questions and concerns with the applicant's hydrologic engineers and is assured that the questions and concerns are understood. In addition, generally acceptable techniques and procedures necessary to respond to staff concerns should be discussed.

II. PROCEDURES

Questions or items of staff concern are to be developed by the EMEB reviewer and discussed in detail with the Branch Chief 7-14 days before the scheduled site visit. For any unscheduled site visit (which may be necessary to resolve issues or prepare for hearings), similar questions or items of staff concern should be prepared at least 3 days prior to such site visit and also discussed in detail with the Branch Chief.

Areas of overlap or interfaces with reviewers in other areas (such as geology, foundation engineering, auxiliary and power conversion systems, mechanical engineering, effluent treatment systems, and structural engineering) should be coordinated before questions or items of staff concern are finalized.

The staff reviewer for Hydrologic Description will discuss any unusual or potentially controversial areas of concern with the Chief, EMEB, prior to transmittal of the questions or items of staff concern to the Project Manager. Transmittal will be forwarded by memo route slip through the Branch Chief.

Site visits are generally to consist of a detailed reconnaissance of site areas and environs with the applicant and technical counterparts, discussions of questions (or items of staff concern), discussions of acceptable methods of analysis, and a general summarization of the areas discussed and conclusions reached.

Normally, a small group composed of the staff reviewer and project manager (PM) should meet with an applicant representative responsible for responding to staff questions and the applicant's technical advisor. For verbal summarization during the site visit, the recommended

method is to have the applicant or his technical advisor summarize the discussions to ensure understanding.

III. TRIP REPORT

A trip report on a site visit should be prepared within 5 days of the reviewer's return. The report is to be as brief as possible and should summarize the trip and the areas of discussion and should list the participants in technical discussions.